

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed September 28, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, such as in paragraph [0035], among others.

In view of the Examiner's earlier restriction requirement, Applicant retains the right to present Claims 17-40 and 43-48 in a divisional Application.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Cole et al. (US 2004/0137978). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

According to the M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Amended Claim 1 provides for

a master gaming controller ...wherein the master gaming controller comprises:
a wireless communication manager executed by the master gaming controller adapted for managing wireless communications between (i) the master gaming controller and the peripheral devices, (ii) the peripheral devices, or both (i) and (ii).

This is further provided in the Specification which states that "master gaming controller 102 can include wireless communication manager 104". (Specification, paragraph [0035]). On the other hand, Cole does not teach or discuss a "master gaming controller comprising: a wireless communication manager adapted for managing wireless communications between (i) the master gaming controller and the peripheral devices, (ii) the peripheral devices, or both (i) and (ii)".

Accordingly, it can not be said that Cole anticipates the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to dependent Claims 2, 15, 16, and 42, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 3-14 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cole in view of Lazzarotto et al (US 6,782,194). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 3-14 and 41 depend on Claim 1. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P060X2).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/
Adrienne Yeung
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001